

**REMARKS****INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 14 and 16 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-14, and 16 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**CHANGES TO THE SPECIFICATION:**

The specification has been reviewed in response to this Office Action. Changes have been made to the specification only to place it in preferred and better U.S. form for issuance and to resolve the Examiner's objections raised in the Office Action. No new matter has been added.

Paragraph [0022] has been amended to change "FIG. 1a" to ---FIG. 1A---. Thus, the specification is submitted to be in allowable form.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS:**

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 3, claims 3 and 13 were objected to because of informalities.

Claim 13 has been amended to correct the informalities. Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, the objections to claims 3 and 13 are now moot.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, numbered paragraph 4, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshikawa (USPN 4,858,219; hereafter, Yoshikawa). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the features of claim 15. Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

It is respectfully submitted that Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest that the central processing unit further outputs an overdrive signal directly inputted to the optical emission driver such that the first and second reference signals comprise signals generated by a closed loop and the overdrive signal comprises a signal generated by an open loop, as is recited in amended claim 14 of the present invention.

Hence, amended claim 14 is not anticipated by Yoshikawa (USPN 4,858,219) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

A. In the Office Action, at pages 3-11, numbered paragraph 5, claims 1-10, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0099177; hereafter, Wang). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 of the present invention has been amended to include the features of claim 3. Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The Examiner admits that “Yoshikawa does not teach the memory that stores certain data used to create linear functions used to control the laser” (emphasis added). Wang does not teach or suggest “wherein the obtaining two or more pairs of first and second channel signal values are operations obtaining the pairs of signal values within a period where a relation between the signal values exhibits a linear function” (emphasis added), which is recited in amended claim 1. Hence, even if combined, Yoshikawa and Wang do not teach or suggest amended claim 1 of the present invention.

Line 20 of claim 6 has been amended to recite, in part: “refers to a linear function reflecting a relation between the pairs of input/output values stored in the memory,” which is not taught by Yoshikawa and Wang. Hence, amended claim 6 is now submitted to be in allowable form.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 12 of the present invention recites: “determine a first target reference signal value and a second target reference signal value of a first reference signal and a second reference signal from a linear relationship of the first and second channel signal values and the first and second output signal values” (emphasis added). As noted above, the Examiner admits that “Yoshikawa does not teach the memory that stores certain data used to create linear functions used to control the laser.” Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest that linear functions are used to control the laser. Wang does not teach or suggest “determining a first target reference value of a first reference signal and a second target reference value of a second reference signal based on a linear relationship of the first and second channel signal values and the first and second output signal values” (emphasis added), which is recited in claim 12. Hence, even if combined, Yoshikawa and Wang do not teach or suggest independent claim 12 of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 13 of the present invention recites: “determining a first target reference value of a first reference signal and a second target reference value of a second reference signal based on a linear relationship of the first and

second channel signal values and the first and second output signal values" (emphasis added).

As noted above, the Examiner admits that "Yoshikawa does not teach the memory that stores certain data used to create linear functions used to control the laser." Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest that linear functions are used to control the laser. Wang does not teach or suggest "determining a first target reference value of a first reference signal and a second target reference value of a second reference signal based on a linear relationship of the first and second channel signal values and the first and second output signal values" (emphasis added), which is recited in claim 13. Hence, even if combined, Yoshikawa and Wang do not teach or suggest independent claim 13 of the present invention.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoshikawa (USPN 4,858,219) in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0099177), alone or in combination. Since claims 2, 4-5, and 7-10 depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, claims 2, 4-5, and 7-10 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoshikawa (USPN 4,858,219) in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0099177), alone or in combination, for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 6 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yoshikawa (USPN 4,858,219) in view of Wang et al. (US 2003/0099177), alone or in combination.

B. In the Office Action, at page 11, numbered paragraph 6, claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of Douglas (USPN 6,762,575; hereafter, Douglas). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the features of claim 15. Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Hence, the rejection of claim 15 is now moot.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:**

In the Office Action, at page 11, numbered paragraph 7, claims 11 and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful review of the claims. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 9. Line 20 of claim 6 has been amended to recite, in part: "refers to a linear function reflecting a relation between the pairs of input/output values stored in the memory." Hence, amended claim 6 is now submitted to be in allowable form.

The features of claim 15 have been added to claim 14, and claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Amended claim 14 is submitted to be in allowable form. Claim 16 has been amended to depend from amended claim 14.

**CONCLUSION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 29, 2006

By: Darleen J. Stockley  
Darleen J. Stockley  
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501